



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,617	12/07/2000	Gregory Weber	CISCO-3168	4191

7590

05/03/2004

Marc S. Hanish
Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640

EXAMINER

SHERKAT, AREZOO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,617

Applicant(s)

WEBER ET AL.

Examiner

Arezoo Sherkat

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4&5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2131

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-19 have been presented for examination.

Drawings

This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borella et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,433 and Borella hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Borella discloses a method for authorizing a command from a user in a network device including:

establishing a RADIUS session with the user (Col. 6, lines 40-59 and Col. 8, lines 15-30);

receiving a user profile for the user from an Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA) server, said user profile containing information regarding which commands the user is authorized to execute (i.e., a user profile may include a class of service field to indicate which class of service the packets from the user may utilize)(Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-15);

storing said user profile in a memory (i.e., storing the user profile)(Col. 9, lines 49-61);

receiving the command (i.e. request) from the user, determining whether the command is authorized based on said information in said user profile stored in said memory, and authorizing or rejecting the command based on the results of said determining (i.e., authorizing the request based on user profile)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 7, Borella discloses an apparatus for authorizing a command from a user in a network device including:

a RADIUS session initiator (Col. 6, lines 40-59 and Col. 8, lines 15-30);

a user profile receiver coupled to said RADIUS session initiator (i.e., a user profile on RADIUS server may include a class of service field to indicate which class of service the packets from the user may utilize)(Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-15);

a memory, a user profile storer coupled to said user profile receiver and said memory (i.e., storing the user profile)(Col. 9, lines 49-61);

a command receiver, an authorized command determiner coupled to said command receiver and to said memory, and a command authorizer coupled to said authorized command determiner (i.e., authorizing the request based on user profile)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 13, Borella discloses an apparatus for authorizing a command from a user in a network device including:

means for establishing a RADIUS session with the user (i.e., RAS client establishes a session with the RADIUS server)(Col. 6, lines 40-59 and Col. 8, lines 15-30);

means for receiving a user profile for the user from an Authentication (i.e., the Access-Request is submitted from the client 22 to the RADIUS server 32 via the network 20), Authorization, and Accounting (AAA) server, said user profile containing information regarding which commands the user is authorized to execute (i.e., a user profile on RADIUS server may include a class of service field to indicate which class of

Art Unit: 2131

service the packets from the user may utilize)(Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-15);

means for storing said user profile in a memory (i.e., RADIUS server stores the user profile)(Col. 9, lines 49-61);

means for receiving the command from the user (i.e., the Access-Request is submitted from the client 22 to the RADIUS server 32 via the network 20), means for determining whether the command is authorized based on said information in said user profile stored in said memory, and means for authorizing or rejecting the command based on the results of said determining (i.e., Once the RADIUS server 32 receives the request, it validates the sending client. A request from a client 22 for which the RADIUS server 32 does not have a shared secret should be silently discarded. If the client is valid, the RADIUS server 32 consults a database of user to find the user whose name matches the request. The user entry in the database contains a list of requirements that must be met to allow access for the user)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 19, Borella discloses a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for authorizing a command from a user in a network device, the method including:

establishing a RADIUS session with the user(Col. 6, lines 40-59 and Col. 8, lines 15-30);

Art Unit: 2131

receiving a user profile for the user from an Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA) server, said user profile containing information regarding which commands the user is authorized to execute (i.e., a user profile on RADIUS server may include a class of service field to indicate which class of service the packets from the user may utilize)(Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-15);

storing said user profile in a memory (i.e., storing the user profile)(Col. 9, lines 49-61);

receiving the command from the user, determining whether the command is authorized based on said information in said user profile stored in said memory, and authorizing or rejecting the command based on the results of said determining (i.e., authorizing the request based on user profile)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 2, 8, and 14, Borella discloses wherein the network device is a Network Access Server (NAS) (i.e., Remote Access Server, RAS)(Col. 1, lines 18-30 and Col. 3, lines 15-67).

Regarding claims 4, 10, and 16, Borella discloses wherein said determining includes comparing said command to a command set contained in said user profile and said authorizing includes authorizing the command if it is contained in said command set (i.e., Once the RADIUS server 32 receives the request, it validates the sending client. A request from a client 22 for which the RADIUS server 32 does not have a

Art Unit: 2131

shared secret should be silently discarded. If the client is valid, the RADIUS server 32 consults a database of user to find the user whose name matches the request. The user entry in the database contains a list of requirements that must be met to allow access for the user)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 17, Borella discloses wherein said command set is a list of previously authorized commands (i.e., If the client is valid, the RADIUS server 32 consults a database of user to find the user whose name matches the request. The user entry in the database contains a list of requirements that must be met to allow access for the user)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borella et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,433 and Borella hereinafter), in view of Theimer et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,555,376 and Theimer hereinafter).

Teachings of Borella have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 6, 12 and 18, Borella does not expressly disclose wherein said command set is described by regular expressions.

However, Theimer discloses wherein said command set is described by regular expressions (i.e., command sets are described by regular expressions and pattern matching is used to determine whether or not a given tuple has been defined in the user profile)(Col. 16, lines 50-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Borella with the teachings of Theimer because it would allow to include command sets that are described by regular expressions with the motivation to provide for a pattern matching technique with considerable amount of flexibility (Theimer, Col. 16, lines 50-67 and Col. 17, 1-10).

Claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borella et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,433 and Borella hereinafter) and Malkin et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,650 and Malkin hereinafter), in view of Torres et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,635 and Torres hereinafter).

Teachings of Borella have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 15, Borella does not expressly disclose the process of terminating the RADIUS session.

However, Malkin discloses further including the process of terminating a RADIUS session (i.e., deregisters the tunnel if the PPP connection with the remote node terminates prior to the expiration of the tunnel)(Col. 5, lines 40-50).

The combined teaching of Borella and Malkin does not expressly disclose purging said user profile from said memory when said RADIUS session is terminated.

However, Torres discloses purging said user profile from said memory (Col. 3, lines 10-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Borella with the teachings of Malkin because it would allow including the process of terminating a RADIUS session with the motivation to deregister the tunnel if the PPP connection with the remote node terminates prior to the expiration of the tunnel (Malkin, Col. 5, lines 40-50) and modify the combined teachings of Borella and Malkin with the teachings of Torres because it would allow purging said user profile from said memory with the motivation to provide for a technique where a single, centralized file contains information about users and applications and the file can be readily, easily, and efficiently modified through a customization user interface to add, delete, and/or update user and application information or to tailor user compute environments (Torres, Col. 3, lines 1-6).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sitaraman et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,618),
Sitaraman et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,977),
Blair, (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,687),
Reiche, (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196), and
He, (U.S. Patent No. 5,944,824).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (703) 305-8749. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arezoo Sherkat
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
April 26, 2004



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100